R E M A R K S

Claims 1-26 were presented for examination and were rejected. The applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 3 has been canceled. Claims 1-26 have been amended to more clearly define the invention. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection of Claims 1-26

Claims 1, 17, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as invention. The Office objected to the use of the word "intended" in the phrase "intended recipient" in the independent claims. Claims 1, 17, 26 were previously amended and do not recite the phrase "intended recipient" any more. Therefore, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 26.

Furthermore, claims 6, 7, 18, and 19 were rejected for failing to cite proper antecedent basis for "said endpoint." The applicants respectfully submit that the claims have been amended to recite "originating endpoint" for which antecedent basis is provided in claims 1 and 17.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 1-26

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by D. Orwick, U.S. Patent 6,201,856 (hereinafter "Orwick").

Furthermore, claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Contractor, U.S. Patent 6,427,001 (hereinafter "Contractor").

Claim 1 recites:

> **1.** A method for comprising:
>
> receiving a communication for a recipient;
>
> identifying one or more designated persons that have been previously designated for an originating endpoint address associated with the received communication, wherein at least one of the designated persons is not a sender of the communication and is not the recipient;

> *generating a notification message, wherein the notification message* *includes information about a response that was dispatched for the received communication;* and
>
> sending the notification message to the one or more designated persons.
>
> *(Emphasis Supplied)*

Neither Orwick nor Contractor teach or suggest, alone or in combination, what claim 1 recites, namely — *an arrangement in which a notification message is generated that includes information about a response that was dispatched for a received communication.*

For both Orwick and Contractor, the notification is independent of the dispatch. Orwick and Contractor do not teach the generation of a notification message that has information beyond the subscriber telephone number, and time/date of the call. **See Orwick col 3, ll. 20-27 and col 4, ll. 18-28**

Generally, Orwick and Contractor report to a third party that an emergency call has occurred. So, for example, these systems would send a notification that a 911 call was placed from a particular house. But, the notification does not contain any additional information about what happened when 911 "dispatched" a response to that call.

For this reason, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1. Because claims 2, 4-16, and 27 depend on claim 1, the rejection of them is also traversed.

Claim 17 recites:

> **17.** An apparatus comprising:
>
> a memory; and
>
> at least one processor, coupled to the memory, operative to:
>
> receive a communication for a recipient;
>
> identify one or more designated persons that have been previously designated for an originating endpoint address associated with the received communication, wherein at least one of the designated persons is not a sender of the communication and is not the recipient
>
> *generate a notification message, wherein the notification message includes information about a response that was dispatched for the received communication;* and
>
> send the notification message to each of the one or more designated persons.
>
> *(Emphasis Supplied)*

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 17.

Because claims 18-25 and 28 depend on claim 17, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of them.

Claim 26 recites:

> 26. An article of manufacture for providing a notification of an event, the article of manufacture comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps of:
>
> receiving a communication for a recipient;
>
> identifying one or more designated persons that have been previously designated for an originating endpoint address associated with the received communication, wherein at least one of the designated persons is not a sender of the communication and is not the recipient
>
> *generating a notification message, wherein the notification message includes information about a response that was dispatched for the received communication; and*
>
> sending the notification message to each of the one or more designated persons.
>
> *(Emphasis Supplied)*

For the Same reasons as for claims 1 and 17, the applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 26.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Amit Goel et al.

By **/Kiril Dimov/**
Kiril Dimov
Reg. No. 60,490
Attorney for Applicants
732-578-0103 x215

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America